APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/679,181	10/03/2003	Gordon Bowman	GLH 08-896329	2790

27667   7590   01/05/2009
HAYES SOLOWAY P.C.
3450 E. SUNRISE DRIVE, SUITE 140
TUCSON, AZ 85718

EXAMINER
AUGUSTINE, NICHOLAS

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2179	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
01/05/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/679,181	BOWMAN ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	NICHOLAS AUGUSTINE	2179	

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>14 October 2008</u>.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>2,4-9,11-13,16-22,25 and 27</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>2,4-9,11-13,16-22,25 and 27</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

        1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

        2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

        3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

A.   This action is in response to the following communications: Amendment filed:

10/14/2008 This action is made **Final**.

B.   Claims 2,4-9,11-13,16-22,25 and 27 remain pending.

Specification

C.   The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for

the claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction

of the following is required: The term "extended presentation markup language" is not

described in the specification.

Claim Objections

Claim 22 objected to because of the following informalities: a typo appears as

the claim currently says it depends from claim 11 not 21 yet claims 11 is directed

towards a system not a method. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public
use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United
States.

2.   Claims 2,4-9,11-13,16-17,20-21,25 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b)

as being anticipated by Macromedia, Extending Dreamweaver,

(http://www.adobe.com/support/dreamweaver/extend.html).

As for dependent claim 2, Macromedia teaches the system as claimed in claim 27,

further comprising an initialization function associated with the viewer for directing the

processing one or more control elements in a document object model of the extended

presentation markup language defining the web application, the initialization function

comprising instructions for traversing each node in a document object model (pg.28,

par.6) searching for nodes identified by the namespace functions associated with the

user interface control elements having names following the predetermined naming

convention generating the function name based on the user interface control identifier of

control elements of the nodes identified by the namespace, the function name

generated following a predetermined naming convention and calling the user interface

control instructions associated with the control element through the generated function

name associated with the control elements, the namespace having names following a

predetermined naming convention (pg.14, 23-25, 28, last par.). Namespaces can be

emulated to some extent by using a naming convention (page 25, line 1; prefix).

As for dependent claim 4, Macromedia teaches the system as claimed in claim 27,

wherein the skin template is associated with the use interface control element by a

reference attribute that comprises a reference to the location of a skin template file

comprising the collection of presentation markup language describing the user interface

control element (pg.254, par.1).

As for dependent claim 5, Macromedia teaches the system as claimed in claim 27,

wherein the user interface control element is associated with an extensible markup

language based element (pg.253, last par.).

As for dependent claim 6, Macromedia teaches the system as claimed in claim 5,

wherein the user interface control element is a parent of an extensible markup language

based element (pg.15, first table).

As for dependent claim 7, Macromedia teaches the system as claimed in claim 5,

wherein the control element is a child of an extensible markup language based element

(pg.15, first table).

As for dependent claim 8, Macromedia teaches the system as claimed in claim 2,

further comprising: a collection of control attributes for adding to the core attributes

(pg.14, fig.1 and pg.328, par.1), the control attributes following the predetermined

naming convention (pg.328; dreamweaver.function ()); and a collection of control

attribute instructions for performing actions associated with the collection of control

attributes, each instruction associated with a control attribute (pg.329, par.1).

As for dependent claim 9, Macromedia teaches the system as claimed in claim 8,

wherein the initialization function contains instructions for traversing each node in the

document object model (pg.28, par.6) and for searching and calling functions

associated with user interface control elements and the control attributes having names

following the predetermined naming convention (pg.28, last par.). Namespaces can be

emulated to some extent by using a naming convention (page 25, line 1; prefix).

As for dependent claim 11, Macromedia teaches the system as claimed in claim 27,

wherein the core attributes comprise state attributes for specifying the identification of a

<state> child element of the control element (pg.15, table; nodes and pg.26 and

27,tables; states).

As for dependent claim 12, Macromedia teaches the system as claimed in claim 1,

wherein the core attributes comprise one or more of: an identification attribute for

referencing the control element (pg.329, par.1); a label attribute for associating text

control (pg.25, table; name); a height attribute for specifies the height of the control

element (pg.25, table; size); a disabled attribute for specifying whether the control

element is disabled and cannot be used (pg.26, table; state); a state hover attribute for

specifying the identification of a <state> child element of the control element, the state

hover attribute used to override the appearance of a hover state as defined in a skin of

the control element (pg.16, table; image and pg.236, par.1); a state focus attribute for specifying the identification of a<state> child element of the control element, the state focus attribute used to override the appearance of a focus state as defined in a skin of the control element (pg.17,table;select and pg.236, par.1); a state up attribute for specifying the identification of a <state> child element of the control element, the state up attribute used to override the appearance of an up state as defined in a skin of the control element (pg.16, table; image and pg.236, par.1); a state down attribute for specifying the identification of a <state> child element of the control element, the state down attribute used to override the appearance of a down state as defined in a skin of the control element (pg.16, table; image and pg.236, par.1); a state hit attribute for specifying the identification of a <state> child element of the control element, the state hit attribute used to override the appearance of a hit state as defined in a skin of the control element (pg.16, table; checkbox and pg.236, par.1); a state disabled up attribute for specifying the identification of a <state> child element of the control element, the state disabled up attribute used to override the appearance of a disabled up state as defined in the skin of the control element (pg. 26,table; state and pg.236, par.1); and a state disabled down attribute for specifying the identification of a <state> child element of the control element, the state disabled down attribute used to override the appearance of a disabled down state as defined in a skin of the control element (pg. 26,table; state and pg.236, par.1).

As for dependent claim 13, Macromedia teaches the system as claimed in claim 12,

wherein the set of control elements comprises one or more of: It is evident that the

following: button, combo box, list box, list view, context menu, item, text box, slider,

scrollbar and spin dial, are taught by Macromedia and thus only one will be analyzed in

detail.

a dsvg:button control element for defining a control that is clicked to trigger an action

(pg.16, object-button, event-onClick), the dsvg:button control element comprising: a

namespace following the predetermined naming convention (pg.14, line1 of last par.);

the common attributes (pg.16,table 1-button); other attributes comprising: a toggle

attribute for specifying whether the button is a toggle or a sticky button (pg.16,table 1,

button –event – onClick); a group attribute for specifying the name of a group to which

the button control element belongs (pg.15, table 1, alltags/elements); and a checked

attribute for specifying whether the button control element is down/checked or

up/unchecked (pg.16, table 1, button); a skin template reference attribute for specifying

the location of a control element skin template (pg.254, par.1), the skin template

reference settable to a uniform resource index (pg.254, par.1); and a customizable skin

template comprising scalable vector graphics markup contained as children of a

container element (pg.36, par.3 and (pg.15, first table);

As for dependent claim 16, Macromedia teaches a method of controlling user interface features of a web application, the method comprising the steps of: describing the web application using an extended presentation markup language, the web application description including control definition comprising a named element identifying a user interface control element of the web application; searching in a document object model of the web application, for user interface controls of the web application designated by a namespace associated with user interface control elemtns of the extended presentation markup language; generating a function name associated with the user interface controls based on the namespace and a user interface control identifier element; and calling control instructions associated with the user interface controls through the generated function name the control instructions defining the behavior of the user interface control element (pg.11, 13-14,28, 69, par. "traversing nodes" and "getting node data").

As for dependent claim 17, Macromedia teaches the method as claimed in claim 16, wherein the step of searching includes the steps of: traversing each node in the document object model (pg.28, par.8); and determining whether the node has a name which matches a designated naming convention (pg.28, par.8; node.name).

As for dependent claim 20, Macromedia teaches the method as claimed in claim 16, further comprising the steps of: searching for a control attribute of a user interface control element in a document object model; and calling control attribute instructions

associated with the control attribute (pg.28, last par.).

As for dependent claim 21, Macromedia teaches the method as claimed in claim 20,

wherein the step of searching for a designated attribute comprises the steps of:

searching attributes of an element in a document object model; determining whether an

element attribute has a name which follows a designated naming convention (pg.19;

"getElementsByTagName (tagName)"). Obtaining attributes from tags, the tags will also

act as a prefix for elements, which belong to a certain attribute(s).

As for dependent claim 25, Macromedia teaches a method of controlling user interface

features of a web application (pg.9, lines 1-2 of par.2), the method comprising the steps

of: adding a behavior element as a child of a user interface control element (pg.216,

"dom.addBehavior ()"); receiving an event which is equal to an event attribute setting in

the behavior element (pg.217, "dom.getBehavior()", where onClick attribute is equal an

event to opening a script event this event is received); and calling behavior element

instructions associated with the behavior element (pg.223,fig.1).

As for independent claim 27, Macromedia teaches a system for controlling user

interface features of a web application, the system comprising: a collection of user

interface control elements including a user interface control element identified in the

web application (pg.7, lines 2-4 of par. 1), the web application described in an extended

presentation markup language (pg.10), the web application description including a user

interface control comprising a name element identifying the user interface control

element of the web application, each of the user interface control elements of the

collection comprising: an associated namespace for identifying the user interface

control element as part of the extended presentation markup language(pg.27,first table

and pg.208,par.2,line 1); a user interface control identifier for associating the user

interface control element with the user interface control of the web application

(pg.27,first table and pg.208,par.2,line 1, pg.216 and 236); and a set of core attributes

common to all of the user interface control elements; a collection of skin templates,

each of the skin templates associated with one of the user interface control elements of

the collection of control elements through one of the core attributes of the user interface

control elements (pg.235-236, 253), each of the skin templates comprising a collection

of presentation markup language describing how to display the User interface control

element associated with the each of the skin templates; and a collection of user

interface control instructions implemented in a viewer for the extended presentation

markup language (pg.253-254), each of the control instructions associated with one of

the user interface control elements through a function name, the function name based

on the namespace and the user interface control identifier of the user interface control

element associated with the web application's user interface control element, the user

interface control instructions defining the behavior of the user interface control element

(pages 10, 23, 25, 36, 44, 253, 262, 268, 329 and 508).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4.   This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of

the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of

the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein

were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation

under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was

not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to

consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g)

prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

5.   Claims 18-19 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Macromedia in view of Cain (US 6,014,138).

As for dependent claim 18, Macromedia teaches the method as claimed in claim 16,

wherein the step of calling a script includes the steps of performing a function stored in

memory having the generated function name (note claim 16 above). Macromedia does

not specifically mention dynamically generating a function name, passing an object,

retrieving the attributes or performing a function having a generated name. However in

the same field of endeavor Cain teaches dynamically generating a function name
associated with the designated element (col. 12, lines 12-13); passing an object
associated with the designated element as a parameter of the generated function (fig.
4H); retrieving the attributes of the object (col.12, lines 29-31); and performing a
function stored in memory having the generated function name (fig.4H-I). It would have
been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the
method of Cain into the method of Macromedia; this is true because Cain's methods
solve the same problem of Macromedia's of custom building a graphical operator
interface (col.1, lines 23-25).

As for dependent claim 19, Macromedia teaches the method as claimed in claim 18,
wherein the step of generating function name includes the steps of (note claims 16 and
18 above). Macromedia teaches determining if the name of the designated element
contains a designated prefix (pg.25, par.1). Macromedia does not specifically mention
generating a function name; assigning an object or assigning predetermined
instructions. However in the same field of endeavor Cain teaches generating a function
name comprising of the name of the designated element (col.12, lines 12-13); assigning
an object associated with the designated element as the parameter of the function
(fig.4H); and assigning control instructions of the designated element as steps for the
function to perform (fig.4H-I). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the
art at the time of the invention to combine the method of Cain into the method of
Macromedia; this is true because Cain's methods solve the same problem of

Macromedia's of custom building a graphical operator interface (col.1, lines 23-25).

As for dependent claim 22, Macromedia teaches the method as claimed in claim

21, wherein the step of calling a script includes the steps of: determining if the name of

the designated attribute contains a designated prefix (pg.19, note claim 21 above);

Macromedia does not specifically mention generating a function name, assigning an

attribute ,object or predetermined instructions. However in the same field of endeavor

Cain teaches generating a function name comprising of the name of the designated

attribute (col. 12, lines 12-13, i.e. "click"); assigning an object associated with the

designated attribute as the parameter of the function name (fig.4H); and assigning

predetermined instructions of the designated attribute as steps for a function having the

function name to perform (fig.4H-I). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill

in the art at the time of the invention to combine the method of Cain into the method of

Macromedia; this is true because Cain's methods solve the same problem of

Macromedia's of custom building a graphical operator interface (col.1, lines 23-25).

(Note:)   It is noted that any citation to specific, pages, columns, lines, or figures in the prior art references and
any interpretation of the references should not be considered to be limiting in any way. A reference is relevant for all it
contains and may be relied upon for all that it would have reasonably suggested to one having ordinary skill in the art. In
re Heck, 699 F.2d 1331, 1332-33, 216 USPQ 1038, 1039 (Fed. Cir. 1983) (quoting In re Lemelson, 397 F.2d 1006,1009, 158
USPQ 275, 277 (CCPA 1968)).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 10/14/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

After careful review of the amended claims (given the broadest interpretation) and the remarks provided by the Applicant along with the cited reference(s) the Examiner does not agree with the Applicant for at least the reasons provided below:

A1.   Applicant argues that Macromedia does not teach the use of an extended presentation markup language.

R1.   Examiner does not agree, Macromedia teaches in many instances as such on pages 10, 23, 36, 44, 253, 262, and 508 to say the least. Examiner notes that the exact terminology "extended presentation markup language" is not described in the specification, but it is believed by the Examiner that the Applicant is referring to extensible markup language or XML for short. Thus it is evident that Macromedia makes use of XML and that the claim language nor the specification excludes any other use of computer implemented language and also that Macromedia teaches a web application that references a control element using an extensible markup language.

A2.   Applicant argues that Macromedia does not teach newly amended limitations, specifically a method that comprises searching a DOM of the web application for control elements of the web application, by searching for nodes that include the namespace of control elements in a collection of the control elements. Once a control element has been found in the DOM, the method generates a function name

based on the control identifier of the control elements which calls instructions
associated with the element.

R2.   Examiner does not agree, Macromedia teaches a method that comprises
searching a DOM of the web application for control elements of the web application, by
searching for nodes that include the namespace of control elements in a collection of
the control elements. Once a control element has been found in the DOM, the method
generates a function name based on the control identifier of the control elements which
calls instructions associated with the element in at least pages 11, 13-14, 23,25, 28, 69
and 71.

A3.   Applicant argues that Macromedia does not teach an initiation function
associated with the viewer that processes the extended presentation markup language
describing the web application.

R3.   Examiner does not agree, Macromedia teaches an initiation function
called MM_Init() at least on page 192.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in
this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP
§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37
CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE
MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Inquires

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nicholas Augustine whose telephone number is 571-270-1056. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday: 7:30- 5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Weilun Lo can be reached on 571-272-4847. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Nicholas Augustine/
Examiner
Art Unit 2179
January 1, 2009

/Ba Huynh/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2179